

10/711,332
Amdt. Dated Jan. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 12, 2005

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6, 12, 15-17, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 37 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588. Claims 8, 10, 21, 33 and 35 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588 in view of Barnhardt. Claims 5, 18, 30 and 40 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588 in view of Dalton. Claims 7, 14, 20, 27, 32 and 39 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588 in view of Turner. Claims 13, 26 and 38 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588 in view of Pelz. Claims 9, 11, 22, 24, 34 and 36 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,793,588. Submitted herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer for U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782.

Claims 1-4, 6, 12, 15-17, 25, 28, 29, 31 and 37 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782. Claims 8, 10, 21, 33 and 35 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782 in view of Barnhardt.

10/711,332
Amdt. Dated Jan. 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of Jan. 12, 2005

Claims 5, 18, 30 and 40 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782 in view of Dalton. Claims 7, 14, 20, 27, 32 and 39 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782 in view of Turner. Claims 13, 26 and 38 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782 in view of Pelz. Claims 9, 11, 22, 24, 34 and 36 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782. Submitted herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer for U.S. Patent Number 6,679,782.

The claims have not been amended and thus it is believed that a listing of the claims is not necessary for this Response and one has not been provided with this Response.

It is believed that the claims are allowable. The Applicants therefore respectfully solicit a Notice of Allowance.

January 20, 2005

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Catania

Michael A. Catania
Registration Number 36,474
Attorney for Applicants
Callaway Golf Company
2180 Rutherford Road
Carlsbad, California 92008-8815
Telephone: 760-930-8493
Facsimile: 760-930-5019
E-mail: MikeCa@callawaygolf.com